## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on May 1, 2008 and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 29 and 30 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As result, claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

Applicant noted that, other than the following rejection, under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, the Final Office Action failed to indicate why claims 3 and 9 were rejected. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for returning Applicant representative's phone call on June 25, 2008, and for explaining why, in the Examiner's opinion, claims 3 and 9 were rejected.

*§ 112 Rejection of Claims 1-28*

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 19 and submits that the amended claims obviate the rejection.

With respect to the independent claims (claims 1 and 19), page 3 of the Office Action states that the phrase "to which of one or more of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds" is unclear.

Applicant amended claims 1 and 19, such that the amended claims now read as "to which of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds" and "to which of the first event request and the second event request the instance of the base event corresponds", respectively. Applicant submits that the claims are now definite and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-28 be withdrawn.

*§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 16-30*

On pages 4-8 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,604,093 to Etzion et al. (Etzion) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,956,800 to Kametani and U.S. Patent No. 5,321,837 to Daniel et al. (Daniel). Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 19 obviate the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a system for notifying clients of job-related event instances. The system includes, among other things, a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, and further configured to receive a notification of an event instance occurring at an event source other than the first trigger engine, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event.

On pages 5-6 of the Final Office Action, the Final Office Action admits that "Etzion fails to disclose a second trigger engine registers multiple event requests that are grouped with similar requests into a base request and wherein the second trigger engine is configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request and further receive notification of an event instance." Applicant submits that Etzion further fails to disclose or suggest a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, and further configured to receive a notification of an event instance occurring at an event source other than the first trigger engine, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event, as recited in claim 1.

On page 6 of the Final Office Action, the Final Office Action states that Kametani teaches outputting of combined data from a first processor to a second processor, which receives the registration of a single base event, and further communicates data back to the first processor.

Kametani relates to an arithmetic operation processing apparatus of a parallel arithmetic operating type, in which additional overhead associated with arithmetic operating processes can be reduced, overall arithmetic operation executing time can be reduced, and high processing speed can be realized (see Kametani at col. 3, lines 32-38). Even if Kametani teaches outputting combined data from a first processor to a second processor, which receives the registration of a single base event, and communicates data back to the first processor, as the Final Office Action at page 6 alleges, and which Applicant neither admits nor confirms, Applicant submits that Kametani fails to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with the other cited references, the second trigger engine being further configured to receive notification of an event instance occurring at an event source other than a first trigger engine, where the event instance corresponds to a base event, as recited in amended claim 1. Kametani further fails to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with the other cited references, that upon receipt of

the notification of the event instance (occurring at the event source other than the first trigger engine), the second trigger engine communicates data indicative of the event instance to the first trigger engine, as recited in amended claim 1.

Daniel relates to an event handling mechanism that categorizes events of a raw event stream into groups of events and associates an action or actions with each group of events (Daniel, at col. 1, lines 7-11). According to Daniel, events of an event stream or streams are filtered into categories or groups of events, and an action or actions are associated with the categorized groups of events (Daniel, col. 2, lines 12-18). Daniel discloses a parsing mechanism, which parses out select elements of each event included in a raw event stream to produce a standardized event, and a filtering mechanism, which applies selection criteria of filter table entries and applies the selection criteria to element types and values of the standardized event (Daniel, col. 2, lines 19-41). If a match is detected, an action mechanism is employed to determine an action to take for a matching group or event entry in an action table.

Applicant submits that Daniel is concerned with receiving multiple events, categorizing the events into groups and performing an action associated with a group to which a received event is categorized. Daniel, as well as the other cited references, are completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, and further configured to receive notification of an event instance occurring at an event source other than the first trigger engine, wherein the event instance corresponds to a base event, as required by claim 1.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and further in view of Daniel and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 2-14 and 16-18 are patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and further in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 2-14 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 19 is directed to a method, in a computer network, for notifying clients of events. The method includes, among other things, combining, at a first trigger engine, a first event request and a second event request into a single base event request,

registering, by the first trigger engine, the single base event request at a second trigger engine of the remote server, receiving, by the first trigger engine from the second trigger engine, notification of an instance of a base event occurring at an event source other than the first trigger engine.

Applicant submits that the above-mentioned features of amended claim 19 are similar to the previously-discussed features of amended claim 1. Applicant further submits that amended claim 19 is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and further in view of Daniel for reasons similar to those discussed with respect claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 20-28 depend from claim 19, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 20-28 are patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 19. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 20-28 be withdrawn.

*§ 103 Rejection of Claim 15*

On page 8 of the Final Office Action, claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and Daniel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,485 to Baber et al. (Baber). Applicant submits that amended independent claim 1 obviates the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1, which is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that Baber fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Etzion and Daniel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

*Conclusion*

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (443-569-0770) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500463.

Respectfully submitted,

By their Representatives,

Date July 30, 2008

By /Richard C. Irving/
Richard C. Irving
Reg. No. 38,499